

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of June 3, 2005.

Acceptance of the drawings is noted. No indications to the contrary, the specification appears accepted.

Regarding claims rejections under 35 USC 112 in paragraph 1, the items with respect to claim 1 have been addressed. The remaining observations are directed to claims that have been canceled, and accordingly no response thereto is deemed necessary. While Applicant is of the opinion that the term "such as" in the preamble aids in the understanding of the claim and is not part of the "claimed invention", the phrase have been removed in amended claim 1.

Applicant also is of the opinion that lines 8 to 9 in claim 1 are grammatically correct and readily understandable, however, the claim has been revised for further clarity.

As Examiner well knows the present invention provides multipurpose tool for use in camping activities. Therein the structural features provide dual functional purposes. The barbs on the base are triangular and downwardly inclined thereby providing the dual function of engaging the support member to resist downward movement in assembly, and when separate perform scraping and scaling functions. The upper arm functions as a hook for hanging items or supporting cross members when deployed in pairs. The upper arm terminates in a thin transverse tip for the additional utile purpose of a screwdriver. In addition to providing a mounting aperture for either a mechanical fastener or for a strap, the transverse opening also provides for manual gripping to perform the scaling and screwdriver functions, and to enable removal of a container top at the lower notch.

Against this background of comprehensive functional and structural benefits, claim 1 was rejected on a serial array of four references. The primary

reference to Rush discloses a garment hanger. The hanger is disclosed in two forms, a plate of Figure 1 or a wire construction of Figure 2 (column 1, lines 13-14). Examiner in the rejection has selected the wire embodiment of Figure 2. With regard to claim 1 as amended, it is readily apparent that substantial and important differences over Rush are recited. The rear unnumbered base of Rush Figure 2 does not have "a plurality of vertically spaced, outwardly and downwardly projecting triangular barbs" for mechanically engaging a support member or performing scraping functions. It is merely a single reversely bent end of wire that is threaded for enabling mounting on a door. The secondary reference to Redman also does not have a plurality of vertically spaced, outwardly and downwardly projecting triangular hooks. It has two laterally spaced reversely bent rearwardly extending prongs 8. As Examiner has selected Figure 2 of Rush, the proposed combination would logically only suggest replacing the threaded end 6 of Rush Figure 2 with a pointed prong, obviously not what the claim recites. The resultant suggested combination would scratch, not scrape. Further, Examiner opines that Rush discloses a thin transverse tip. The end of the upper arm of Rush is clearly semicircular and obviously would not function as a screwdriver. It is not understood how such structure can be interpreted to be a "thin transverse tip" as recited in claim 1. It is not seen how a wire construction could achieve such configuration other than by reference to Applicant's disclosure. For these reasons, it is submitted that amended claim 1 recites patentable differences over the cited art and allowance thereof is requested. An interpretation of the reference can be advanced.

Claims 2 through 10 have been canceled.

New claims 11 through 17 depend from amended claim 1 and are thus also thought allowable. More particularly, claim 11 recites the notch in the lower arm and a sharp tip projecting into the notch for removing a cap from a

container. The member 6 with the edge 7 obviously could not be incorporated on the wire unit of Rush. Claim 12 recites the aperture for mechanical fastener mounting. Such a mounting is not possible on the wire unit of Rush. Claims 13-16 are directed to the strap mounting of the hook. The primary reference to Rush contemplates only wall or door mounting. It is inconceivable that it would be modified with a strap. Brocco relates to a bow hanger for an archery bow. It is not seen how this is analogous art. Even if the proposed combination is proper, it would suggest using a strap to hang supplement articles from the Rush holder A, and not as an alternative for the mounting thereof. For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicant submits that dependent claims 11-17 are allowable.

An earnest effort has been made to place the application in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests notification of the allowance of claims 1, and 11 through 17.

Dated: August 24, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

MILLS LAW FIRM PLLC



Peter D. Sachtjen, Reg. No. 24,619

Mills Law Firm, PLLC
Post Office Box 1245
Cary, NC 27512
Telephone: (919) 462-3036
Facsimile: (919) 462-3041
Attorney Direct Line: (252) 413-0475